

The terrorists are not after you, the United States, and not even after the coalition. The terrorists are after the Iraqi people. Every action—blowing up an oil line, blowing up a water line—hurts the Iraqi people, not the United States and not the coalition itself. That voice coming from the Iraqi leadership I think will be hugely helpful.

Iraqis do not like the U.S. occupation in and of itself. They are a proud people and they want that sovereignty. Yes, we are going from occupation to mission. Iraqis do want freedom. They do want democracy. But the President this week, with whom many of us had the opportunity to meet, and the Prime Minister said the goal is democracy.

Last week—and I will close shortly—the U.N. Security Council unanimously approved a new U.S. resolution. The resolution outlines that transfer of sovereignty to the new interim Iraqi government and the role of the coalition forces after June 30. The world community is now united behind the Iraqi people, and with every passing day the Iraqi people, with the coalition's help, are building the capacity to govern themselves.

As in the past, we must stay the course. We will stay the course. We will keep true to the principles. We will have continued faith in our superb Armed Forces. We know that history in the end will be on our side.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the unused leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business for up to 60 minutes, with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Who seeks recognition?

The Senator from Wyoming.

#### IRAQ

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I was very pleased to hear about the leader's trip to Iraq. Having been there several months ago, I think things have changed some, certainly. I think they are even stronger there than they were and things are better than we hear about here. So I say to the majority leader, I am delighted you were there.

#### DEFINING THE ISSUES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we are faced now with a relatively short period of time to finish our work for this year. We are down to a certain number of weeks—not very many—to do many things. We have a short time to finish the jobs that need to be finished. So I

wish to comment a little on some of the things I have been thinking about in terms of the broader aspect of what our responsibilities are in the Senate.

In the Senate, we are faced, of course, with many and varied issues. We have to deal with all kinds of things that happen and all kinds of issues that are brought up which are very legitimate. I guess this is my point: Our job is also to define the kinds of issues that are appropriate to be handled in the Senate, to be handled in the Congress, to be a part of the Federal activity.

Sometimes I think we find ourselves having all kinds of issues come up in this Chamber which one could question as to whether this is the role of the Federal Government. Of course, our basic decisionmaking comes from the Constitution. But the Constitution is obviously fairly broad in its terms, so there is always a different kind of feeling, a different definition for what are the appropriate roles, the appropriate issues in which the Federal Government should be involved.

I guess I am sometimes reminded that the Federal Government is only one of the functions that we have in this country to carry out the leadership and the activities for our country.

It is the United States of America, so that the Federal Government's role is to bring together those things that affect a number of States, and the States to do those things that are involved in their State. They are closer to the people in the State.

We also, of course, have county governments. We have State governments, and we have city governments. We have nongovernmental units. We have voluntarism. We have all kinds of things that are there.

One of the elements of our work is to decide what should be treated as legitimate Federal issues and the kind with which we should be concerned here. I think we are challenged every day with that kind of definition. I am not going to try to cite all the different ones that come up, but I can tell you there are things that come up that you would have a hard time saying: Hey, that is the role of the Federal Government to decide.

It is particularly appropriate to bring this up, after having spent the weekend celebrating Ronald Reagan's work as President and the job he did in leadership. His basic thought, you remember, all through his whole involvement was less government rather than more and wanting it to be more efficient rather than less efficient. So it does seem appropriate that we talk about those kinds of things as we go about our struggle.

We are involved now, for instance, with the establishment of a budget. Frankly, a lot of people say: What do you want a budget for; you don't pay any attention to it anyway.

That isn't true. The budget is kind of that definition of where we are going, and the Federal Government has some

control in that if you go beyond the budget in the appropriations process, which often happens, then there is the defense mechanism that you can raise a point of order where it takes 60 votes to get it passed. So it is interesting to me that now we are having time for the budget. In fact, time for the budget has actually passed. Remember, this is the fiscal year that ends at the end of September, and we are supposed to have all of our appropriations finished by that time. To do that, you really should have a budget. And we are here on the cusp of having a budget, yet with some fairly insignificant differences why we are held up and don't have one.

I was struck the other day by reading a little quote from James Madison. He said:

In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place, oblige it to control itself.

That is difficult, a large event like we have in the Federal Government, to control the size and the activities of the Federal Government. So I think in many ways it has grown beyond what most people would have envisioned in years past. Whenever there seems to be a problem here, now we have continued to create the notion that you need some money for this, you need some money for that on the local level. Let's get the Federal Government to pay it. Then, on the other hand, we say: taxes are too high. Why should we be paying this much?

So there is this built-in contradiction that is always there. But we need to take a look at the dollars spent. We need to take a look at the size of the Federal Government, the number of employees in the Federal Government, the number of agencies we have, and more difficult than anything else is to kind of keep track of the number of programs that are funded by the Federal Government. It is difficult sometimes.

One of the difficulties is programs become established, and they continue. Times change. What was appropriate to do 10, 15 years ago may not be appropriate now, but it seems to be very difficult to ever do anything about the programs that exist, that sort of perpetuate themselves.

So I think it really is interesting to deal with this issue and, again, to think about the role of the Federal Government.

We are doing something in the committee that I chair, the Parks Subcommittee, where we have more and more heritage areas. We find ourselves having heritage areas most everywhere, and you get a little advantage locally. I understand that. But we are trying now to put down the definition of what a national heritage area ought to be. There are State heritage areas; there are local heritage areas; and then there are national ones, each of which has different characteristics. So these